	ed States Patent a	ND TRADEMARK OFFICE	UNITED STATES DEPAR United States Patent and Address: COMMISSIONER F P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22: www.uspto.gov	OR PATENTS
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,202	12/10/2003	Martin M. Liphardt		4605
75	90 12/15/2005		EXAM	INER
JAMES D. WELCH 10328 PINEHURST AVE.			MERLINO, AMANDA H	
OMAHA, NE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
- ,			2877	
		DATE MAILED: 12/15/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/731,202	LIPHARDT ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Amanda H. Merlino	2877
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address
 A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory periof Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mate earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a r iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON atute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. eply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>10</u>) December 2003.	
	his action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allow		
closed in accordance with the practice unde	er Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D	0. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) <u>1 and 2</u> is/are pending in the applic	cation.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd	Irawn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 2</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	a/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a	accepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to t	••••	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei	ign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	i 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:		
1. Certified copies of the priority docume		
2. Certified copies of the priority docume		
3. Copies of the certified copies of the p		received in this National Stage
application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a l		received
	ist of the certified copies not	
Attachment(s)		
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/ 		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/10/03</u> .	6) 🗌 Other:	'

Application/Control Number: 10/731,202 Art Unit: 2877

Claim Objections

Claims 1-2 objected to because of the following informalities: in claims 1-2, the

variable θ ' is not defined in the claims. All variables need to be defined in the claims

even though they are defined in the specification. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Obenreder (3,857,637).

Obenreder teach of a method of investigating a sample in accordance with figure 3 which comprises a substrate (21) with a thin film coating (col 4; lines 41) with a beam of electromagnetic radiation (17) which impinges at an oblique angle of incident (col 3; lines 8-10), said method eliminating the effects of reflection from the backside of said substrate (21) (col 4; lines 23-29) by placing a shield having a hole upon the surface of the substrate wherein the incident beam (17) reflects from the surface of the substrate (17), said reflected beam having no component therein which reflected from the backside of said substrate (17) and further comprising the step of analyzing the reflected beam. Obenreder also teaches that it is well known in the art that a beam striking a surface is reflected from the top surface and from the opposed surface thereto

Application/Control Number: 10/731,202 Art Unit: 2877

۰.

and that the distance between the reflected beam from the opposed surfaces depends on the angle of incident, the index of refraction of the glass and the thickness of the glass (col 4; lines 11-18).

Obenreder et al lacks the teaching of the effective radius of the hole on the shield being of a specific value as shown by the equation D <= 2T TAN (θ ').

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that even though Obenreder does not directly state the equation to calculate the effective radius of the hole on the shield, Obenreder is inherently using the equation by calculating the effective radius using trigonometry since he does teach that all the variables of the equation (angle of incident, index of the refraction of the substrate, the thickness of the substrate etc..) are needed to calculate the effective radius of the hole on the shield to block the reflections from the backside of the substrate. Examiner notes that the even though the equation is not specifically shown by Obenreder, it is inherent that Obenreder is calculating the effective radius of the hold on the shield to block the reflection from the backside of the substrate.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Chandley (5,298,974) teach of a shield with a hole (figure 2) to block backside reflections.

Application/Control Number: 10/731,202 Art Unit: 2877

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amanda H Merlino whose telephone number is 571-272-2421. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday and Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory J Toatley, Jr. can be reached on 571-272-2800 ext 77. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Amanda H Merlino sh Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2877 December 8, 2005

Examiner